

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are pending, with Claims 1 and 2 being independent. Claims 3, 6, 7, and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, and 4 have been amended. The Official Action asked that Applicant provide support for the amendments. In response, Applicant respectfully wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to, e.g., pp. 62, 66-69, and p. 27 and Figs. 41 and 42, among other places (see, e.g., p. 62 regarding operation request; p. 67 regarding notifying; pp. 66, 68 regarding updating; and pp. 68, 72 regarding recognizing, among other places). Of course, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments.

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as being indefinite. All rejections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims in a manner earnestly believed to avoid the grounds of rejection. In particular, the Official Action stated that the claims do not recite notifying a first device that a data communication for a second buffer has been completed and updating a second data buffer for which a data communication has been completed in accordance with the notification, and the claims have been amended in keeping with this kind comment to include such features.

Claims 1 through 7 and 12 again were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 2003/0182503 A1 (Leong, et al.) in view of US 6,820,187 B2 (Asano, et al.) (with passing mention being made of Tanenbaum and Palatov at pp. 6-7 of the Official Action). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 2 variously recite, *inter alia*, that the second device further comprises a recognizing unit that recognizes, in accordance with the second operation request block, that the first data buffer should be used for a new data communication and the second data buffer should be used for the data communication already designated by the operation request block.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied documents, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 2.

The Official Action states “note that the first and second data buffers may be accessed by two I/O tasks which do not have corresponding child I/O tasks and thus will not be suspended in order to wait for any child tasks to complete (Leong Fig. 4-5, paragraph 0094).” Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing. Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing, and submits that Leong, et al. [0094] (which states, *inter alia*, that the I/O tasks are sent to the I/O stack individually and are scheduled and serviced without regard to their relationship to each other), and Leong, et al.’s discussion of parent and child I/O tasks, is wholly silent at least as regards the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that Asano, et al. discloses, e.g., that the DMA controller issues a command completion notice together with the VTID corresponding to the performed command (e.g., col. 10, lines 20-30), but Asano, et al. fails to remedy Leong, et al.’s deficiencies.

Applicant further respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features. By means of such features, Applicant respectfully submits

that it is possible to perform another processing using the first data buffer even if the data communication for the second data buffer has not been completed, and that it is possible to improve the efficiency of processing.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/  
Daniel S. Glueck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DSG/ijr